Exhibit 7

Redacted Version of Document Sought to be Sealed

Case 4:20-cv-03664-YGR Document 696-9 Filed 08/18/22 Page 2 of 6 CONFIDENTIAL

```
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 1
         NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION
 2
 3
 4
        CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,
        JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER CASTILLO,)
 5
        and MONIQUE TRUJILLO, individually )
        and on behalf of all others
 6
        similarly situated,
                                             )
             Plaintiffs,
                                             )
 7
                                                Case No.:
                                                5:20-cv-03664-LHK-SVK
            vs.
 8
                                             )
        GOOGLE, LLC,
                                             )
 9
             Defendant.
                                             )
10
11
12
13
14
                             CONFIDENTIAL
15
           VIDEO-RECORDED REMOTE DEPOSITION OF STEVE GANEM
16
                    Huntington Beach, California
17
                Wednesday, March 23, 2022; 12:37 p.m.
18
19
2.0
21
22
       REPORTED BY:
23
       Victoria A. Guerrero, CSR, RPR, RMR, CRR
24
        Job No. 5130916
25
        Pages 1 - 113
                                                            Page 1
```

Case 4:20-cv-03664-YGR Document 696-9 Filed 08/18/22 Page 3 of 6 CONFIDENTIAL

		LI		
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	1	INDEX TO EXAMI	NATION
2	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, SAN JOSE DIVISION	2	WITNESS: STEVE	GANEM
3	CHACOM PROVING WHILLIAM DVATT	3		
4	CHASOM BROWN, WILLIAM BYATT,) JEREMY DAVIS, CHRISTOPHER CASTILLO,)	4	EXAMINATION:	PAGE LINE
5	and MONIQUE TRUJILLO, individually)		By Ms. Nyborg-Burch	7 14
	and on behalf of all others	5		
6	similarly situated,)	6	* * *	
	Plaintiffs,)	7		
7) Case No:	8		
	vs) 5:20-cv-03664-LHK-SVK			
8		9		
0	GOOGLE, LLC,)	10		
9	Defendant)	11		
10)	12		
11	,	13		
12		14		
13		15		
14		16		
15		17		
16	BE IT REMEMBERED that, pursuant to Federal	18		
17 18	Rules of Civil Procedure, the deposition of STEVE GANEM was taken before Victoria A Guerrero,	19		
19	California Certified Shorthand Reporter, Registered	20		
20	Merit Reporter, and Certified Realtime Reporter, on	21		
21	Wednesday, March 23, 2022, commencing at the hour of	22		
22	12:37 p m , the witness responding to questions by	23		
23	videoconference from Huntington Beach, California;			
24	the questions being propounded and proceedings	24		
25	reported remotely via videoconference Page 2	25		Page 4
	1 age 2			1 age 4
1	REMOTE APPEARANCES:	1	INDEX TO EXHIBITS	
2	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS:	2 3	STEVE GANEM Brown, et al. vs. Google	
4	BOIES SCHILLER FLEXNER	4	Wednesday, March 23, 202	22
-	ERIKA NYBORG-BURCH	5	Victoria A. Guerrero, CSR, RPF	R, RMR, CRR
5	BEKO REBLITZ-RICHARDSON MARK MAO	6	AADVED DESCRIPTIO	M DACE LINE
6	44 Montgomery Street, 41st Floor	7	MARKED DESCRIPTION	ON PAGE LINE
7	San Francisco, California 94104 T 415 293 6800	'	xhibit 1 Life of a Visit;	28 9
7	enyborg-burch@bsfllp com	8	GOOG-BRWN-0002681	2 through
8	brichardson@bsfllp com	9	26830	
9	mmao@bsfllp com	9	xhibit 2 Google Analytics: S	tarting 41 15
10	FOR THE PLAINTIFFS IN "CALHOUN V GOOGLE":	10	Conversation;	
11	BLEICHMAR FONTI AND AULT	, ,	GOOG-CABR-0038131	2 through
12	ANGELICA M ORNELAS	11 12	00381576 Exhibit 3 Declaration of Steve	Ganem 60 1
12	555 12th Street, Suite 1600 Oakland, California 94607	12	Regarding Google Analy	
13	T 415 445 4011	13	Opposition to Plaintiffs'	
14	aornelas@bfalaw com	1.4	Motion for Class Certific	cation
15	FOR THE DEFENDANTS:	14	(No Bates) xhibit 4 Slide deck produced	by 71 10
16	QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART & SULLIVAN, LLP		S. Pothana; GOOG-BRV	
17	ALY OLSON STEPHEN BROOME	16	through 00550644	
1/	865 Figueroa Street, Tenth Floor	17	xhibit 5 6/25/21 email to S. P	othana 91 9
18	Los Angeles, California 90017	18	from S. Ganem; GOOG-BRWN-0059792	20 through
19	T 213 443 3000 F 213 443 3100		00597922	
19	alyolson@quinnemanuel com stephenbroome@@quinnemanuel com	19		
20	•	20	* * *	
21	ALSO DESENT.	21 22		
22 23	ALSO PRESENT: Matthew Gubiotti, Google in-house counsel	23		
24	Sean Grant, Videographer	24		
25	D 2	25		D F
	Page 3			Page 5

Case 4:20-cv-03664-YGR Document 696-9 Filed 08/18/22 Page 4 of 6 CONFIDENTIAL

1 the data they're supplying is kept separated from 15:56:18 the signed-on peadonymous fastestest. 15:56:18 so So fits it a discussion about technologies 15:56:22 dweecould apply to make it actually impossible for 15:56:22 dweecould actually im				
So this is a discussion about technologies 15.56.22 4 we could apply to make it actually impossible for 15.56.23 15.56.34 5 coople for early with the signed-out 15.56.48 7 perudonymous dataset. 15.56.59 7 perudonymo	1	the data they're supplying is kept separated from 15:56:13	1	A It's a User ID baseview 15:59:55
4 we could apply to make it actually impossible for	2	the signed-out pseudonymous dataset. 15:56:18	2	Q And so the reference here where it says, 16:00:00
5 Google to ever do anything, combine their dataset. 15:56:42 to this signed-in dataset with the signed-out 15:56:544 pseudourynous dataset. 15:56:48 So I - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:48 So I - sorry. So, I interrupted you. 15:56:49 Q Go ahead. Sorry. No, I interrupted you. 15:56:49 So I - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:53 So I - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:49 So I - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:49 So I - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:53 So I - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:53 So I - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:59 So I -	3	So this is a discussion about technologies 15:56:22	3	Assuming UID is stored in anonymous baseview today, 16:00 02
6 this signed-in dataset with the signed-out	4	we could apply to make it actually impossible for 15:56:27	4	is that saying that is currently stored in 16:00:09
7	5	Google to ever do anything, combine their dataset, 15:56:32	5	anonymous baseview? 16:00:14
8 S 1 - sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:48 8 S Q And do you have clarity now on that 16:00:35 10 A S offis statement you're referring to about 15:56:54 15:66:54 1	6	this signed-in dataset with the signed-out 15:56:39	6	A I was actually unclear of that And in 16 00:26
9 Q Go ahead. Sorry. No. I interrupted you. 15.56-649 9 subject? 1600.36 1600.35 1600.036 1	7		7	this thread aimed to get clarity on that subject 16:00:30
10	8	So I sorry. Go ahead. 15:56:48	8	Q And do you have clarity now on that 16:00:35
11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	9		9	subject? 16:00:36
12 to meet our customer's expectations around 15:56:57 15 separation of that data. 15:56:59 15 separation of that data. 15:57:39 15 separation of that data. 16:01:13 16:0	10	A So this statement you're referring to about 15:56:53	10	A Yes I believe that the User ID itself is 16:00:46
15 Separation of that data. 15:56:59 15:57:05 15 about the being enabled, what is an 7 15:57:28 15:57:38 15:57:38 15:57:38 15:57:38 15:57:39 15:57	11	using encryption is a mechanism that would enable us 15:56:54	11	also stored as metadata in the anonymous baseview 16:00:53
15 No.	12	•	12	today which enables us to, among other things, 16:01:01
15 15.57.08 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.39 15.57.36 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.38 15.57.39 15.5	13	separation of that data. 15:56:59	13	export it to big query, which is for our customers 16:01:05
15.57:28	14		14	to be able to perform custom processing and analysis 16:01:10
15:57:33 18 15:57:36 15:57:36 15:57:36 16:01:24 16:01:24 16:01:24 16:01:24 16:01:24 16:01:24 16:01:24 16:01:25 16:01:2	15		15	on their data 16:01:13
15:57:36 19 15:57:39 19 15:57:36 19 15:57:36 19 15:57:37 20 15:57:53 21 15:57:53 22 24 25 26 27 28 28 29 29 29 29 29 29 20 29 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20			16	
15:57:39 20 21			17	• •
15:57:46			18	•
22 2 3 15:57:53 15:58:03 15:58:03 15:58:03 15:58:03 15:58:03 15:58:03 15:58:03 15:58:03 15:58:09 Page 94 25 87 MS NYBORG-BURCH: 16:01:47 16:				
22 Q		-	20	·
15:58:03 15:58:03 23 BY MS NYBORG-BURCH: 16:01:47 24 Q And where you said, Sure, but we could 16:01:47 25 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 26 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 27 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 28 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:47 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16:01:54 29 start; do you know what you were referring to, right 16			21	Calls for speculation 16:01:40
24 Page 94 Page 94 Page 94 Page 94 Page 94 Page 95 Page 94 Page 96			22	THE WITNESS: I'm not sure 16:01:46
25			23	BY MS NYBORG-BURCH: 16:01:47
Page 94 Page 95 Page 96 Page 96 Page 96 Page 96			24	Q And where you said, Sure, but we could 16:01:47
MS. OLSON: Fm just going to take the 15:58:17 3 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:18 3 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:20 4 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:21 4 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:22 5 open And do you see where Sree Pothana wrote 16:02:23 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:23 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:32 16:02:	25	•	25	
MS. OLSON: Fm just going to take the 15:58:17 3 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:18 3 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:20 4 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:21 4 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:22 5 open And do you see where Sree Pothana wrote 16:02:23 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:26 16:02:23 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:31 16:02:32 16:02:	1	discussion. We haven't finalized. 15:58:10	1	below? 16:01:54
3 opportunity to designate the transcript as 15:58:18	2	MS. OLSON: I'm just going to take the 15:58:17	2	A I believe I interpreted her response to 16:02:10
4 Confidential. 15:58:20			3	
MS. NYBORG-BURCH: Okay. I think we'll do	4		4	
The with specific designations 15:58:27	5	MS. NYBORG-BURCH: Okay. I think we'll do 15:58:23	5	Q And do you see where Sree Pothana wrote 16:02:23
8 MS. OLSON: That process relates to 15:58:34 8 down. 16:02:36 9 Attorneys' Eyes Only designations; but yes, we'll do 15:58:35 9 A Yes. 16:02:36 10 that. 15:58:38 10 Q What was not encrypted what historical 16:02:39 11 MS. NYBORG-BURCH: Yes. Okay. You're 15:58:42 11 data was not encrypted and joinable? 16:02:42 12 right. Thank you, Aly. 15:58:43 12 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:02:47 13 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:58:44 13 speculation. 16:02:48 14 Q So the question was whether you had 15:58:45 14 THE WITNESS: See, this there's an 16:02:50 15 testified that anonymous baseview is where the 15:58:45 15 existing feature, which is User ID, which is not 16:02:51 16 Client ID is stored. 15:59:02 16 separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics 16:02:57 17 today and is not we don't communicate any 16:03:02 16:03:02 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the 15:59:	6	the same as we've done before where you'll follow up 15:58:24	6	later down, that, We still will have historical data 16:02:26
9 Attorneys' Eyes Only designations; but yes, we'll do that. 15:58:38 9 A Yes. 16:02:38 10 that. 15:58:38 10 Q What was not encrypted what historical data was not encrypted and joinable? 16:02:39 11 MS. NYBORG-BURCH: Yes. Okay. You're right. Thank you, Aly. 15:58:43 12 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:02:47 13 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:58:44 13 speculation. 16:02:48 14 Q So the question was whether you had 15:58:45 15:58:45 14 THE WITNESS: See, this there's an 16:02:50 15 testified that anonymous baseview is where the 15:59:02 15:58:58 15 existing feature, which is User ID, which is not 16:02:51 16 Client ID is stored. 15:59:02 16 separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics 16:02:57 16:02:57 17 A Yes, that's correct. 15:59:08 17 today and is not we don't communicate any 16:03:02 16:03:02 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the 15:59:17 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 10 UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:14 21 THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 21 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 22 Where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:52 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable	7	•	7	that is not encrypted and joinable. Just two lines 16:02:31
10 that. 15:58:38	8	MS. OLSON: That process relates to 15:58:34	8	
10 that. 15:58:38 10 Q What was not encrypted what historical data was not encrypted and joinable? 16:02:39 11 MS. NYBORG-BURCH: Yes. Okay. You're right. Thank you, Aly. 15:58:43 12 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for speculation. 16:02:42 13 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:58:44 13 speculation. 16:02:48 14 Q So the question was whether you had sterified that anonymous baseview is where the setified that anonymous baseview is where the sterified that anonymous baseview is where the sterified that anonymous baseview is where the separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics separately encrypted from the rest of Analyt	9	Attorneys' Eyes Only designations; but yes, we'll do 15:58:35	9	A Yes. 16:02:38
12 right. Thank you, Aly. 15:58:43 12 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:02:47 13 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:58:44 13 speculation. 16:02:48 14 Q So the question was whether you had 15:58:45 14 THE WITNESS: See, this there's an 16:02:50 15 testified that anonymous baseview is where the 15:58:58 15 existing feature, which is User ID, which is not 16:02:57 16 Client ID is stored. 15:59:02 16 separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics 16:02:57 17 A Yes, that's correct. 15:59:08 17 today and is not we don't communicate any 16:03:02 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 20 MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28 20 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 21 THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 21 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 22 Where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:50 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 24 with a ? 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	10	that. 15:58:38	10	Q What was not encrypted what historical 16:02:39
12 right. Thank you, Aly. 15:58:43 12 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:02:47 13 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:58:44 13 speculation. 16:02:48 14 Q So the question was whether you had 15:58:45 14 THE WITNESS: See, this there's an 16:02:50 15 testified that anonymous baseview is where the 15:58:58 15 existing feature, which is User ID, which is not separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics 16:02:57 16:02:57 17 A Yes, that's correct. 15:59:08 17 today and is not we don't communicate any separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics 16:03:02 16:03:02 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the UID is stored? 15:59:17 18 expectation that it would be to customers. 16:03:06 19 UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 20 MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28 20 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 21 THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 21 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 22 Where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:50 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 15:59:52 24 with a	11	MS. NYBORG-BURCH: Yes. Okay. You're 15:58:42	11	
13 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:58:44 14 Q So the question was whether you had 15:58:45 15 testified that anonymous baseview is where the 15:58:58 16 Client ID is stored. 15:59:02 17 A Yes, that's correct. 15:59:08 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the 15:59:10 19 UID is stored? 15:59:17 20 MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28 21 THE WITNESS: See, this there's an 16:02:50 22 where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:42 23 key data. 15:59:50 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 26 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	12	right. Thank you, Aly. 15:58:43	12	**
testified that anonymous baseview is where the Client ID is stored. 15:59:02 16 Client ID is stored. 15:59:08 17 Client ID is stored. 15:59:08 17 today and is not we don't communicate any 16:03:02 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the UID is stored? 15:59:17 18 expectation that it would be to customers. 16:03:06 19 UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:14 19 UID is stored? 15:59:42 19 Instorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 19 Instorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 19 Instorical data that's not encrypted and j			13	·
testified that anonymous baseview is where the Client ID is stored. 15:59:02 16 Client ID is stored. 15:59:08 17 Client ID is stored. 15:59:08 17 today and is not we don't communicate any 16:03:02 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the UID is stored? 15:59:17 18 expectation that it would be to customers. 16:03:06 19 UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:14 19 UID is stored? 15:59:42 19 Instorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 19 Instorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 19 Instorical data that's not encrypted and j	14	Q So the question was whether you had 15:58:45	14	THE WITNESS: See, this there's an 16:02:50
16 Client ID is stored. 15:59:02 16 separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics 16:02:57 17 A Yes, that's correct. 15:59:08 17 today and is not we don't communicate any 16:03:02 18 Q And is anonymous baseview also where the 15:59:10 18 expectation that it would be to customers. 16:03:06 19 UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 20 MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28 20 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 21 THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 21 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 22 where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:44 22 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20 23 key data. 15:59:50 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 24 with a ? 16:03:23 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	15	testified that anonymous baseview is where the 15:58:58	15	
Q And is anonymous baseview also where the UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 20 MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28 20 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 21 THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 21 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 22 where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:44 22 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 24 with a ? 16:03:23 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	16	Client ID is stored. 15:59:02	16	separately encrypted from the rest of Analytics 16:02:57
19 UID is stored? 15:59:17 19 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 20 MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28 21 THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 22 where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:44 23 key data. 15:59:50 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 26 And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09 27 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 28 29 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 29 HYMS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20 20 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 21 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 22 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 With a 16:03:23 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 26 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	17	A Yes, that's correct. 15:59:08	17	today and is not we don't communicate any 16:03:02
MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28 20 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 21 THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 22 where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:44 23 key data. 15:59:50 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 26 historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14 27 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 28 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20 29 With a Product 16:03:20 20 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 20 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 21 just reflects the current state of the product 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 23 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 24 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 25 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 26 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 27 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 28 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 29 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 20 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 21 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 22 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 23 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 24 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 25 Wistorical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:17 26 Wistorical data that's not en	18	Q And is anonymous baseview also where the 15:59:10	18	expectation that it would be to customers. 16:03:06
THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42 21 just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17 where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:44 22 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20 key data. 15:59:50 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 24 with a ? 16:03:23 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	19	UID is stored? 15:59:17	19	And so Sree's statement that, We will have 16:03:09
22 where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:44 22 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20 23 key data. 15:59:50 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 24 with a ? 16:03:23 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	20	MS. OLSON: Objection. Lacks foundation. 15:59:28	20	historical data that's not encrypted and joinable, 16:03:14
23 key data. 15:59:50 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 24 with a ? 16:03:23 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	21	THE WITNESS: There is separate storage 15:59:42	21	just reflects the current state of the product. 16:03:17
23 key data. 15:59:50 23 Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20 24 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 15:59:52 24 with a ? 16:03:23 25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	22	where we a parallel storage where we keep User ID 15:59:44	22	BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:03:20
25 Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52 25 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27	23		23	Q And would that historical data be joinable 16:03:20
į į	24	•	24	
Page 95 Page 97	25	Q And what is that storage? 15:59:52	25	MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:03:27
	1	Page 95		Page 97

Case 4:20-cv-03664-YGR Document 696-9 Filed 08/18/22 Page 5 of 6 CONFIDENTIAL

		_	
1	speculation. 16:03:28	1	settings and the fact that we have time to launch 16:06:17
2	THE WITNESS: This is a thread from nine 16:03:29	2	the feature which make this point or this concern 16:06:20
3	months ago. And my understanding is that this is 16:03:32	3	moot. So there will be no concern about 16:06:23
4	first of all, the feature has not launched. So 16:03:40	4	joinability. And some questions about where a join 16:06:29
5	we're talking speculatively about the behavior of a 16:03:44	5	could occur, to me, seem irrelevant. 16:06:32
6	still-to-be-implemented feature. 16:03:47	6	BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:06:34
7	And then additionally, this is something 16:03:50	7	Q Sure. It may be irrelevant, but my 16:06:35
8	that we are we are addressing with the design, I 16:03:54	8	question is, in the context of this document, where 16:06:37
9	believe. So if and when this new feature does come 16:03:59	9	was the concern that joins would occur back in June 16:06:39
10	to light and if encryption of this data is something 16:04:04	10	of 2021? 16:06:43
11	that we believe our customers would demand, if we 16:04:08	11	MS. OLSON: Objection. Asked and answered. 16:06:51
12	promised that we will do it, we will do it. 16:04:13	12	Calls for speculation. And mischaracterizes the 16:06:51
			•
13	BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:04:16	13	document. 16:07:01
14	Q And do you know in the statement, we will 16:04:16	14	THE WITNESS: Sorry. I'm still not 16:07:13
15	have historical data that is not encrypted and 16:04:19	15	following. I'm hung up on this I really will 16:07:14
16	joinable, do you know where this join would happen? 16:04:22	16	just end up repeating myself, that there is no 16:07:16
17	MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:04:27	17	actual concern of joinability and you're asking 16:07:19
18	speculation. 16:04:27	18	where joins could occur. 16:07:22
19	THE WITNESS: To say that something is 16:04:31	19	BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:07:23
20	joinable is not to say something will be joined. 16:04:32	20	Q So let's turn to the page ending in 9 16:07:24
21	Often in Google we go to great lengths to make joins 16:04:38	21	MS. OLSON: This is actually a good 16:07:28
22	impossible. So that any speculation that Google 16:04:43	22	stopping point. It's been about another hour. 16:07:29
23	would do some joining would be, on their face, false 16:04:46	23	MS. NYBORG-BURCH: We'll just finish this 16:07:32
24	because it would be literally impossible. 16:04:52	24	document and we'll stop. I'm almost done. 16:07:33
25	/// 16:04:53	25	/// 16:07:35
	Page 98		Page 100
1	BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:04:55	1	BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:07:39
2	Q Let me rephrase. Do you know in this 16:04:59	2	Q Do you see where Sree wrote, At least we 16:07:39
3	statement, do you know where this join could happen, 16:05:01	3	have options to think through without expensive 16:07:41
4	not that Google would do it? 16:05:06	4	rewrites? And you wrote, Exactly, but is that the 16:07:46
5	MS. OLSON: Objection. Asked and answered. 16:05:09	5	only potential join key? Do you see that? 16:07:49
6	Calls for speculation. 16:05:11	6	A I do. 16:07:54
7	THE WITNESS: No. There is no process that 16:05:17		
		7	O What was the potential join key being 16:07:54
ı 8	<u>.</u>	'	Q What was the potential join key being 16:07:54 referred to there? 16:07:56
8	would aim to join these things. This discussion is 16:05:18	8	referred to there? 16:07:56
9	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24	8 9	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01
9	would aim to join these things. This discussion is 16:05:18 about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27	8 9 10	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02
9 10 11	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28	8 9 10 11	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09
9 10 11 12	would aim to join these things. This discussion is 16:05:18 about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29	8 9 10 11 12	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12
9 10 11 12 13	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31	8 9 10 11 12 13	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16
9 10 11 12 13 14	would aim to join these things. This discussion is 16:05:18 about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34	8 9 10 11 12 13 14	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16
9 10 11 12 13 14 15	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a 16:05:50	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a joining of that data. 16:05:55	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a 16:05:50	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41 which doesn't exist yet, and the pseudonymous 16:08:47
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a joining of that data. 16:05:55	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a 16:05:50 joining of that data. 16:05:55 MS. OLSON: Objection to the 16:05:57	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41 which doesn't exist yet, and the pseudonymous 16:08:47
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a 16:05:24 join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a joining of that data. 16:05:55 MS. OLSON: Objection to the 16:05:57 characterization of the document and calls for 16:06:00	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41 which doesn't exist yet, and the pseudonymous 16:08:47 baseview. 16:08:51
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a 16:05:50 joining of that data. 16:05:55 MS. OLSON: Objection to the 16:05:57 characterization of the document and calls for 16:06:00 speculation. 16:06:02	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41 which doesn't exist yet, and the pseudonymous 16:08:47 baseview. 16:08:51 And the concern was resolved in this 16:08:55
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a 16:05:55 MS. OLSON: Objection to the 16:05:57 characterization of the document and calls for 16:06:00 speculation. 16:06:02 THE WITNESS: I think if you read the 16:06:07	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41 which doesn't exist yet, and the pseudonymous 16:08:47 baseview. 16:08:51 And the concern was resolved in this 16:08:55 thread. And you'll see that Sree answers in the 16:08:58
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	would aim to join these things. This discussion is about how making it so that even in theory such a join would not be possible. 16:05:27 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:05:28 Q Right. And I understand that this 16:05:29 conversation is, in part, about that. My question 16:05:31 was, where Sree wrote, We still will have historical 16:05:34 data that is not encrypted and joinable, and this 16:05:41 was a concern, where was where would that join be 16:05:44 able to happen? Not where would Google perform a 16:05:50 joining of that data. 16:05:55 MS. OLSON: Objection to the 16:05:57 characterization of the document and calls for 16:06:00 speculation. 16:06:02 THE WITNESS: I think if you read the 16:06:07 document in context and in total you'll see that the 16:06:08	8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	referred to there? 16:07:56 MS. OLSON: Objection. Calls for 16:08:01 speculation. 16:08:02 THE WITNESS: This is a reference to 16:08:09 and UID. 16:08:12 BY MS. NYBORG-BURCH: 16:08:16 Q And so the join key would be between a UID 16:08:16 and an 16:08:20 A The UID, in theory; but again, it was 16:08:32 rendered moot. Could, without any changes, 16:08:37 potentially be a join key between the space, 16:08:41 which doesn't exist yet, and the pseudonymous 16:08:47 baseview. 16:08:51 And the concern was resolved in this 16:08:55 thread. And you'll see that Sree answers in the 16:08:58 next question that there are no other potential join 16:09:01

Case 4:20-cv-03664-YGR Document 696-9 Filed 08/18/22 Page 6 of 6 CONFIDENTIAL

1	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	1	_X_ Federal R&S Requested (FRCP 30(e)(1)(B)) - Locked .PDF
2	I, VICTORIA A GUERRERO, California Certified Shorthand	2	Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and
3	Reporter, Registered Merit Reporter, Certified Realtime	3	make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included
4	Reporter, do hereby certify that, pursuant to Federal Rules	4	below, notating the page and line number of the corrections.
5	of Civil Procedure, STEVE GANEM appeared remotely before me	5	The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty
6	at the time and place mentioned in the caption herein; that	6	of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all
7	the witness was, by me, first duly sworn/affirmed under oath	7	appearing counsel within the period of time determined at
8	and examined upon oral interrogatories propounded by counsel;	8	the deposition or provided by the Federal Rules.
10	that said examination together with the testimony of	9	Federal R&S Not Requested - Reading & Signature was not
11	said witness was taken down by me in stenotype and	10	
12	transcribed through computer-aided transcription; I further		requested before the completion of the deposition.
13	certify that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney	11	
14	of the parties, nor financially interested in the action;	12	
15	and the foregoing transcript, pages 1 through 109,	13	
16	review requested by the witness or a party, constitutes a	14	
17	full, true, and correct record of such testimony adduced and	15	
18	oral proceedings had and of the whole thereof	16	
19	WITNESS MY HAND AND DIGITAL SIGNATURE this Monday,	17	
20	March 28, 2022	18	
21	1	19	
22	lating & Juna	20	
		21	
23		22	
	Oregon CSR No 14-0428 (exp 6-30-2023)	23	
24	(-1	24	
25	California CSR No 8370 (exp 3-15-2023)		
25	Hawaii CSR No 490 (exp 12-31-2022) Page 110	25	Page 112
	1.05-110		16-112
1	ALY OLSON, ESQ.	1	BROWN V. GOOGLE
	ALY OLSON, ESQ. alyolson@quinnemanuel.com		BROWN V. GOOGLE STEVE GANEM (#5130916)
2	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com	2	STEVE GANEM (#5130916)
2 3 4	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022	2	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATA SHEET
2 3 4 5	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE	2 3 4 5	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATA SHEET PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916	2 3 4 5 6	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been	2 3 4 5 6	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Contact Veritext	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Locked .PDF	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all appearing counsel within the period of time determined at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all appearing counsel within the period of time determined at	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) – Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all appearing counsel within the period of time determined at the deposition or provided by the Code of Civil Procedure.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all appearing counsel within the period of time determined at the deposition or provided by the Code of Civil Procedure. Waiving the CA Code of Civil Procedure per Stipulation of	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all appearing counsel within the period of time determined at the deposition or provided by the Code of Civil Procedure. Waiving the CA Code of Civil Procedure per Stipulation of Counsel - Original transcript to be released for signature	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON PAGELINECHANGE
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all appearing counsel within the period of time determined at the deposition or provided by the Code of Civil Procedure. Waiving the CA Code of Civil Procedure per Stipulation of Counsel - Original transcript to be released for signature as determined at the deposition.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON REASON REASON REASON REASON REASON
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	alyolson@quinnemanuel.com MARCH 28, 2022 RE: BROWN V. GOOGLE MARCH 23, 2022, STEVE GANEM, JOB NO. 5130916 The above-referenced transcript has been completed by Veritext Legal Solutions and review of the transcript is being handled as follows: Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Contact Veritext to schedule a time to review the original transcript at a Veritext office. Per CA State Code (CCP 2025.520 (a)-(e)) — Locked .PDF Transcript - The witness should review the transcript and make any necessary corrections on the errata pages included below, notating the page and line number of the corrections. The witness should then sign and date the errata and penalty of perjury pages and return the completed pages to all appearing counsel within the period of time determined at the deposition or provided by the Code of Civil Procedure. Waiving the CA Code of Civil Procedure per Stipulation of Counsel - Original transcript to be released for signature as determined at the deposition. Signature Waived – Reading & Signature was waived at the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	STEVE GANEM (#5130916) ERRATASHEET PAGELINECHANGE REASON REASON REASON REASON REASON REASON REASON REASON